Hosty - Lilo note

To Quin Shea from Harold Weisberg JFK assassination appeals 3/30/79
"Privacy" vis historical cases for newspaper editors who write page-1 articles
Oswald's visit to the FBI and alleged threats against it and an SA

Previously I have written to ask where the records relating to the above-captioned subject are. From the "previously processed" notations in the Dallas files and the absence of any index or guide it was impossible to locate any such records.

By accident I have located some but not all in the voluminous records, not in consecutive serials. As of now I have not located the FBI's own final report or the materials it gathered for its internal investigation. I have found many of what the FBI regards as affidavits and references to the results of investigations of the matter not included in the statements.

I attach page one only of 62-109060-7226X. It typifies all that is wrong, wasteful and entirely unjustifiable in the FBI's attitude and processing of these records which are so embarrassing to it.

Make any kind of bet you want: the withheld information is the name Johnson and the newspaper The Dallas Times-Herald. Now this is not an educated guess from a subject expert. It is because all is public domain. This clearly is in the FBI files. It is in many if not most of the statements. It is in, very prominently in, the 8/31/75 issue of that paper, which made a big front-page splash. The extensive attention includes Johnson's taking the entire matter up with FBIHQ, in a separate box as I recall.

But were none of this true, how can these withholdings possibly be justified? And what need could have been served? Given the subject matter, carefully obscured in this self-serving FBI cover-the-ass paper, how could the withholding be justified under any conditions? Is there anything that better fits the description of the Congress of what can not be withheld? Of course, this is an historical case. So you and through you the Department and perhaps in time the courts will have this view of the FBI's performance in historical case maximum disclosure.

There also was a public House hearing on the matter, about 11/75. This also is long before the processing of the records. In fact, one of the records I have found in the transcript of Adams' testimony, so the processors did not have to have any other knowledge to know this was all public domain. However, the statements I've read to now include specific references to the extensive press attention. Radio, TV, the Dallas papers, Time magazine, the wire services - all in the statements taken from various FBI people. All read by those who perpetrated these withholdings.

If by chance claim to 7D was made, that also is fraudulent, obviously. I'm not taking time to check the worksheets.

You will recall that recently I've note how unusual it is that some FBI people were sounding off to the press, one James Patrick Hosty, Jr., in particular. He has since

retired but his blabbing of what is not even good propaganda preceeded his retirement. It is not often that the FBI tolerates a public attack on a Congressional committee by a Special Agent and I can't imagine that many Special Agents within days of retirement have ever done this. Nor can I imagine that Hosty endangered his retirement by doing it.

What is involved in the suppression by the FBI of an extraordinary matter for almost a dozen years. Dozens if not more FBI people of all ranks knew about it and not one said a word until, by one of those remarkable coincidences, the retirement of the Dallas SAC was safe and secure. Then only was there a look to the Dallas paper less inclined to publishing any criticism of the official account of the JFK assassination.

It seems that the only official candidate for assassins, officially elected to that distinction, went to the Dallas FBI office two or three days before the assassination. He asked to see Hosty, who was not in. So, without bothering to seal it, he left a note or letter for Hosty. With it sticking partly out of the envelope the receptionist read it.

Then the President was killed, Hosty head Oswald's name and recognized it as a case he had, and with what is decribed as "the memory of an elephant," never once gave thought to this letter. It turns out that in all the varying accounts the one consistency is that it was a threat. The more than ten versions of the threat have to do with the looking of the FBI office and/or the police headquarters. Naturally the FBI assured the Warren Commission and the country that Oswald had no history indicative of any tendency for violence.

Even when Hosty was rushed over to interview Oswald, he claims, this note "never entered my mind."

That this was widely and apprehensively known throughout the entire Dallas Field Office is clear in the statements I've read. It was known at high level in Dallas.

There is more. After Hosty's complaint prior to the look to the paper. His complaint was made in person to Director Kelley, who then made some inquiry no records of which I've yet seen. (What does this do to any CD claim?) But I think you need no more. (There is other JD audit claim written on some of the missing pages I've read.)

Until Watergate I never believed that any number of Americans could conspire and not one of them let a word out. This was years before Watergate. And oddly enough the Commission was supposedly investigating a report of Oswald's having an FBI connection, which the FBI and its Director assured the Commission was false. Only several of the SAs whose statements I've just read state they understood Oswald was a source or informant. So it is only natural that shoptalking memories should fail and that none of these people would think of providing any information to what after all was only a Presidential Commission. Or to the FBI's own inspectors, one of who was assigned to Dallas immediately.

In this connection you might find the content of the Commission's 11/22/64 executive session transcript, the one they decided to destroy. It is in Post Norton.